

**REMARKS**

In the January 25, Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 3-20 were pending in the application; objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a); objected to the specification; rejected claims 3, 8, 10, 12, 17 and 19 under the first paragraph of 35 USC § 112; rejected claims 3-18, 10-17, 19 and 20 under 35 USC § 102(e); and rejected claims 9 and 18 under 35 USC § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,161,107 to Stern and 5,907,837 to Ferrel et al. (References B and J, respectively) were cited. Claims 3-11, 14, 16, 18 and 20 have been cancelled and thus, claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed.

**The Drawings**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for failure to show 9 features that were recited in the claims and allegedly were not illustrated in the drawings. As noted above, claims 3-11, 14, 16, 18 and 20 have been cancelled and therefore the features identified by the Examiner that were only recited in these claims will not be addressed. Furthermore, the remaining claims have been amended, so that "distributed hierarchical system" is no longer recited. The remaining features are discussed below.

With respect to container objects, the Examiner's attention is directed to paragraph [0009] and Fig. 2 which describe H-Container 1 as a container object containing objects Chart 1 and Chart 2, which in turn are container objects that respectively contain objects ES-Auto 1 and 2, and ES-Auto 3. As described in the first sentence of paragraph [0014], the H-Container 1 is the "lowest possible container in the hierarchy." Paragraph [0014] also describes IDx as a "connection" and the last sentence of paragraph [0016] states that "the connections are stored as monikers". Finally, as noted in paragraph [0024], Fig. 3 provides an "illustration for moving an object" and one of ordinary skill of the art would understand that moving an object is an object operation. The description which follows in paragraph [0025] explains how the context illustrated in Fig. 3 is used in the operation of moving an object.

If there are any remaining questions regarding how the drawings illustrate the features recited in the currently pending claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone to arrange an Examiner Interview prior to issuing another Office Action, so that resolution of the remaining issues can be expedited.

### **Objection to Specification**

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure for use of terms such as "ES-Auto and Active Directory Service without any description indicating how these tools are related to, configured and coupled into the system and method described as the invention." Although well known in the art, and therefore believed to be easily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, the term "active directory service" has been deleted from the specification, as it is not essential for an understanding of the invention. The term "ES-Auto" is simply an arbitrary label used as a name of an object and it is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be confused by the use of these characters for that purpose.

If there are any remaining issues regarding the adequacy of the disclosure, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone as discussed above with respect to the objection to the drawings.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

On pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 3, 8, 10, 12, 17 and 19 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Since claims 3, 8 and 10 have been cancelled, only claims 12, 17 and 19 will be addressed below.

With respect to claim 12, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art is very familiar with "hierarchically structured objects" (claim 12, line 1) and no further explanation of such are required in the specification. The translated term "indirection stages" has been amended to recite "indirection levels" (claim 12, last three lines). It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art is familiar with many forms of indirection and would have no difficulty understanding how "contexts" as used in the specification can provide "a plurality of indirection levels." For example, Ferrel et al. refers to an "extra level of indirection of the file system within a file" (column 11, lines 39-40).

With respect to claim 17, submitted herewith as Exhibit A is the definition of "moniker" from the website [whatis.techtarget.com](http://whatis.techtarget.com). The term "moniker" is also used in Farrell in e.g., column 4, lines 24-26. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art is sufficient familiar with this term that no further explanation of the meaning of the term is required in the specification.

With respect to claim 19, it is not understood why further definition of the terms "global, central management functions" would be required. The meanings of these terms appear to be reasonably clear in any context and since the terms are used as a negative limitation, anything

which would constitute central management affecting all objects to perform moving, copying renaming would be excluded. The example of how the present invention provides for moving of objects that is described in paragraphs [0021] to [0024] further clarifies what types of central management functions are not used. Therefore, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have little difficulty understanding the scope of claim 19.

For the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejections under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner is unfamiliar with the language used in the claims and requires additional evidence of how any of the terms in the claims are used by those of ordinary skill in the art, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing another Office Action, to improve the process of communicating what evidence is required, so that acceptable evidence can be obtained.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

On pages 7-9, claims 3-8, 10-17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ferrel et al. Since only claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 are now pending and these claims were not individually discussed in the rejection, the language in the amended claims will be compared with the portions of Ferrel et al. that were cited in rejecting claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10 which approximately correspond to claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19, respectively.

As stated in the Abstract and throughout the specification, Ferrel et al. describes a conventional solution utilizing "globally unique identifier[s] (GUID)" (e.g., column 15, lines 1-2). Claim 12, on the other hand, recites a different solution where "each object ... [has] an environment in which it is known" (claim 12, line 3) and "where the identifiers of the objects within each environment are obligatory unique, but are allowed to be non-unique relative to other objects within different environments" (claim 12, lines 6-8). This is distinctly different from what is disclosed by Ferrel et al.

Due to this fundamental difference between the present invention and Ferrel et al. many of the other features of the invention are implemented differently than in Ferrel et al. As a result, there are numerous difference between the present invention and Ferrel et al. It is submitted that the amended claims could only be rejected by a reference disclosing an object-oriented environment in which objects are permitted to be globally non-unique. Since this is not the case in Ferrel et al., it is submitted that claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 patentably distinguish over Ferrel et al.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

On pages 10-11, claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ferrel et al. in view of Stern. Since claims 9 and 18 have been cancelled, this rejection is moot. However, it is noted that nothing was cited or has been found in Stern suggesting how Ferrel et al. could be modified to operate in an environment in which identifiers of objects are not globally unique, as recited in claim 12. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 patentably distinguish over Ferrel et al. in view of Stern.

**Summary**

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not reach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Entry of the Amendment, reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7/25/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 7/25/2005  
STAAS & HALSEY Richard A. Gollhofer  
By: 7/25/05  
Date: 7/25/05